REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strauss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,612). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed to a system (claim 1) and method (claim 18) for providing a remote caller profile service, whereby caller profile information relating to a subscriber may be delivered to a called party terminal for a call executed by the subscriber from a remote terminal (claim 1) and the service may be activated from a remote terminal (claim 18). It is noted, the term "remote terminal" refers a terminal **other than the one to which the caller subscribes** (i.e., other than the subscriber's "home phone") from which the calling party subscriber will be making an outgoing call. Thus, for example and without limitation, the claimed invention enables a subscriber to place a call from his neighbor's phone, yet appear to a called party to have been originated from the subscriber's home phone (i.e., presuming the caller profile information of the subscriber corresponds to his home phone).

The Strauss patent describes a selective caller ID service that may be considered a "caller profile" service but not a **remote** caller profile service, as claimed, because it can not be implemented from a remote terminal.

The service described in Strauss is implemented in an Advanced Intelligent Network containing a plurality of Service Switching Points (SSPs) connected to an Integrated Service Control Point (ISCP). The ISCP contains a database including a plurality of Call Processing Records (CPRs) associated with various subscribers; and the CPRs index information relevant to the subscriber stored in a Line Identification Database (LIB). When a caller wishes to invoke the selective caller ID service, he dials an access code for which triggers have been set in the SSPs and which corresponds to an entry in the caller's CPR (e.g., *61 for a first alternate listing, *62 for a second alternate listing). The access code triggers the terminating switch to query the ISCP; and the ISCP refers to the CPR to interpret the access code and to retrieve the appropriate caller ID information. In such manner, a caller may select alternate caller ID information for display to a called terminal by entering different access codes, provided the different access codes are pre-established triggers in the SSPs and indexed in the caller's CPR.

Bushnell 15   5

It is important to note however, the selective caller ID service described in the Strauss patent is not a remote caller profile service, as claimed, because it must be implemented from the calling party line (i.e., the subscriber's "home" phone). If a subscriber were to attempt to invoke the service from a remote terminal (e.g., by dialing *61 from a neighbor's phone), the ISCP would refer to the neighbor's CPR in attempt to interpret the access code. Consequently, the ISCP will either be unable to process the call (if the entered access code is not indexed to the neighbor's CPR) or will process the call by retreiving and displaying the neighbor's caller ID information (if the entered access code is indexed to the neighbor's CPR). There is no mechanism disclosed or suggested in Strauss that would allow a subscriber to invoke display of his own profile information when calling from a remote terminal*. Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 8 and 18-20 patentably distinguish over Strauss and are in condition for allowance.

*As noted above, the term "remote terminal" refers a terminal **other than the one to which the caller subscribes** (i.e., other than the subscriber's "home phone") from which the calling party subscriber will be making an outgoing call. The Office Action suggests that the calling party station is a remote terminal (referring to col. 9, lines 47-53, the claim recites a step of "receiving, at a location **remote** from said calling party station, input ....) but this is referring to a call processing entity (e.g., the ISCP) receiving and detecting dialed digits/access code at a location remote from the calling party station. The referenced text does not indicate that the calling party station is a remote terminal, as claimed, that is other than the the one to which the caller subscribes. On the contrary, as has been noted, the service described in the Strauss patent must be implemented from the subscriber's "home" line and can not be implemented from a remote terminal, as claimed.

2. In view of the above amendments and remarks, entry of the amendments and a notice of allowance of claims 1, 7, 8 and 18-20 is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.

Bushnell 15   6

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

          Steven R. Santema
          Attorney for Applicants
          Registration No. 40,156
          Phone: (630) 979-7006

Date: _4/6/06_____

Send all correspondence to:
Docket Coordinator
Lucent Technologies, Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Room 3J-219
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030

Bushnell 15   7